



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.untot.org/

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/648,918	08/25/2000	Peter K. Cheo	PC-12	7311
75	90 08/27/2003		·.	
M P Williams			EXAMINER	
Patent Counsel 210 Main Street			NGUYEN, TUAN M	
Manchester, CT	06040		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2828	
			DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

/ .		\triangle			
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/648,918	CHEO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Tuan M Nguyen	2828			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut. - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	136(a). In no event, however, may a ly within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI e, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07</u>	<u>January 2003</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ T	nis action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the applicatio	n				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	wit from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		R 1 20			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.		7000 P			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/a Application Papers	or election requirement.	PAUL IP SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce		the Evaminer			
	•				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	_ , ,,	and an arrangement of the contract of the cont			
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	8 119(a)-(d) or (f)			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority ariasi so s.s.s.	3 110(4) (4) 01 (1).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
Copies of the certified copies of the price					
application from the International Bi * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ireau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	ic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
 a) The translation of the foreign language pr 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes 					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01) Office A	ction Summary	Part of Paper No. 10			

Art Unit: 2828

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Interview Summary

1. With respect to the response filed on 01-07-2003, the telephone interview response is in error and the statements are derogatory with racial discrimination in nature. The response fails to comply with rule 37 CFR 1.3.

Response to Amendment

2. With respect to the response filed on 01-07-2003, claims 1-13 have been reconsidered and the claims 1-13 are withdrawn for the follow reasons.

Drawings

- 3. This application has been filed with informal drawings, which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.
- 4. The drawing figure 1 are objected for minor informalities. The figure 1 number (25) pointed two different places. Applicant is required to submit a drawing correction for approval as require by rule 37 CFR 1.123.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On the specification page 5 line 10, "inner cladding 22" and line 16 "the pump cladding 22" both inner cladding and pump cladding are referred to the same number 22. It is not consistent. Furthermore, on page 5 line 10 referred to "an outer cladding 23" in fig. 1. Number 23 could not be found in the figure 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2828

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding to claims 1-21, the claims are couched on terms of as how the things are being done as considered as narrative language. The claims are written in such a narrative way that the claims fail to comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraphs. Furthermore, claims 1 and 14 recite a clad pumped, double clad, fiber laser. The preample of the claims fail to clearly define whether the invention is limited into a clad-pumped or a double clad or a fiber laser, which render the claims are confusing, vague and indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2828

. دره

- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 8. Claims 14, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiGiovanni et al (5,708,669) in view of Keck (4,415,230).

With respect to claim 14, DiGiovanni et al discloses article comprising a cladding pumped optical fiber laser comprising optical fiber (10) for a cladding pumped fiber laser, outer cladding (11), inner cladding (13), a core (12) disposed within a pump cladding, the core comprises a rare earth dopant, note col. 1 line 16 to col. 2 line 61, see fig. 1. However DiGiovanni do not discloses each core having an oblong cross section. Whereas Keck discloses the core having an oblong cross section, note col. 3 line 61, see fig 6. For the advantageous of the cladding pump, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide DiGiovanni with the core having an oblong cross section as taught or suggested by Keck.

With respect to claim 15, DiGiovanni discloses the optical fiber (10) has one core (12), see fig. 1.

With respect to claim 20, DiGiovanni discloses the cladding pump optical fiber (10) has a circular cross section, see fig 1.

9. Claims 16-17, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiGiovanni et al (5,708,669) in view of Keck (4,415,230) further in view of Scifres (5,566,196).

With respect to claim 16, DiGiovanni and Keck discloses all limitations as set forth in claim 14 except for plurality of cores with substantially the same cross sectional are as each other

Art Unit: 2828

of the cores. Whereas Scifres disclose cores (11) have the same diameter of about 10 µm or less, note col.3 line 21, see fig. 1. For the advantageous of the cladding pump optical fiber, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide DiGiovanni with the plurality cores having the same cross sectional area as taught or suggested by Scifres.

With respect to claim 17, Scifres discloses multiple non-concentric core regions embedded within lower refractive index cladding material, note col. 7 line 5 to 14.

With respect to claim 19, Scifres discloses the core regions (11) may have a diameter of $10 \mu m$ or less, alternately, may have a larger diameter on order to support multiple modes of propagation. The core (11) may be spaced with their core regions edges within about $2 \mu m$ of neighboring core regions in order to allow interaction of the evanescent light for phase locking of the core regions, note col. 3 line 20-37.

With respect to claim 21, Scifres discloses the cores (51a-51e) have rectangular cross section, note col. 3 line 44, see fig 5.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 01-07-2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 9 Applicant argues, "Keck discloses and is totally concerned with an optical wave-guide and not a laser". It is disagreed because applicant in figure 1 shows a laser fiber (19) comprises an inner cladding (22), an outer cladding (23), a single core (20). Whereas Keck shows in figure 6 a laser fiber (70) comprises an inner cladding (78), an outer cladding (74) and a

Art Unit: 2828

single core (80). There is no different between the applicant fiber laser and Keck fiber laser.

Page 6

Furthermore, claims 14 recite a clad-pumped, double clad, fiber laser comprising each core

having an oblong cross section. Whereas Keck discloses fiber laser (70) comprises a core (80)

has an oblong cross section, see figure 6.

Accordingly to the above reasons Applicant's argument is not persuasive. Claims 1-21 are not

patentable over Keck

Communication Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tuan M Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0247.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on (703) 308-3098. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular

communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-3329.

Paul Ip

SPE

Art unit 2828

TMN

August 20, 2003

، محمد و بن